

The Asian Connection

U.S. forces too often fight each other in a secret war against the Golden Triangle's heroin suppliers.

Once more the United States is fighting a seemingly endless war in Southeast Asia. Despite successful American-sponsored offensives, the enemy has grown steadily more intractable. And as before, the American effort has been hobbled by dangerous and self-defeating bureaucratic battles among the federal agencies responsible for the struggle. But the ultimate aim of the war in the notorious Golden Triangle of Southeast Asia is irreproachable: to shut down the opium fields and heroin refineries located in the highlands of Burma, Thailand and Laos. This area—controlled by independent warlords rather than organized governments—is fast becoming the heartland of the international heroin trade. Elaine Shannon of NEWSWEEK reports:

The Trail of the Horse begins high in the mountain jungle on the Burmese side of the border. There, most of the Golden Triangle's opium crop—700 metric tons a year, according to U.S. estimates—is refined into heroin. Then it is moved by horse and donkey caravans into northern Thailand. From there, transportation to Bangkok is easy, thanks to a network of modern roads the United States built during the Vietnam War. And after Bangkok comes the world: heroin produced in the Golden Triangle now accounts for 20 percent of the American market, double the figure of just three years ago.

Chiang Mai, a northern Thai trading center adorned with glittering temples and villas, is a principal way station on the heroin highway from Burma to Bangkok. With the encouragement of the friendly Thai government, Chiang Mai has also become the command post for America's latest war in Southeast Asia; and the news from the front is decidedly mixed. Heroin seizures in Thailand are at record levels—more than 1,200 pounds so far this year. Yet drug agents readily admit this is just the tip of a mountain of white powder. About 100 pounds of high-quality heroin a week leave Thailand on trawlers bound for Hong Kong and Europe, much of it destined for America—in part to replace a shortfall from Pakistan. Because of

a bumper crop in Burma, the wholesale price of top-grade No. 4 heroin is at its lowest level in years. And drug officials warn that the Mafia has begun to join forces with Chinese crime families who have long controlled this bountiful harvest.

Meanwhile, America's war in Chiang Mai all too often takes the form of a three-cornered bureaucratic struggle, producing



Thai farmer with ripe poppies: A cash crop too good to give up

chaos, waste and needless endangerment of American lives. The principal antagonists are the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and the CIA. Theirs is the classic philosophical and tactical fight between cops and cloak-and-dagger operatives. The DEA believes in classic aboveground police work, helping the Thai border patrol to arrest and win convictions of major drug refiners and wholesalers. The CIA actively entered the fray in 1981, in part because its director, William Casey, believed that the opium trade in Southeast Asia would be used to fund communist plans for regional takeover. Working in close conjunction with the Thai military, the CIA has been running clandestine antinarcotics operations along the border with Burma. Then

assault on the heroin refineries in the nearby jungle. In early 1983 the CIA dispatched a commando mission into Burma, searching for one of the DEA's most-wanted men—an elusive Chinese refiner named Lao Su. Thai Army commandos failed to find Lao Su, but the operation complicated DEA plans to trap Lao Su on his next trip across the Thai border. A week later the DEA's own call for help in capturing Lao Su was answered by overzealous Lahu tribesmen, who brought the refiner to the border—and heaved his bullet-riddled body into a Thai border-patrol helicopter.

Ambush: The most chilling bureaucratic blunder occurred last October when the CIA station chief in Chiang Mai apparently placed a higher priority on secrecy than on the safety of a DEA agent. Both agencies were organizing raids on the same drug transaction: the planned sale of 42 kilograms of pure heroin in the Thai frontier hamlet of Pha Ni. But the CIA station chief kept his own plans secret, even after the DEA agent told him that he would be accompanying the Thai border patrol to Pha Ni. Only a last-minute phone call from Washington—where the CIA and the DEA had better liaison—prevented the drug agent from driving into the CIA-sponsored ambush.

In early December, prompted by the Pha Ni incident, DEA Administrator Francis (Bud) Mullen hammered out a formal concordat with John McMahon, the deputy CIA director. According to a CIA source, McMahon acknowledged that "Bangkok was being a little twerky" with the DEA—and he ordered the Thai contingent to "get in a more cooperative state of mind." So far, the new arrangement, which gives the DEA a voice in plans for border raids, has been successful. Relations between the two agencies in Thailand are now correct if cool—probably all that can be expected, given their differences in style and tactics.

Even the CIA's most successful antidrug operations have been marred by unintended

Greece Orders U.S. Aide to Leave; Says He Was a Key C.I.A. Agent

By JOHN TAGLIABUE

Special to The New York Times

ATHENS, May 18 — A Government spokesman said today that Greece had expelled a United States diplomat. The spokesman affirmed a published report here that the envoy was an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Government spokesman, Dimitris Maroudas, said the contents of the report, in a Greek satirical newspaper, were accurate, but would not elaborate. The newspaper report appeared earlier today, shortly before the Government announcement.

The report, in the newspaper Pontiki, said the diplomat, whom it identified only as Huey, had been expelled for engaging in improper activities. The newspaper said the diplomat posed as a United States Embassy employee, but was in fact the "deputy C.I.A. station chief."

A United States Embassy spokesman, Gary Edwards, refused to comment on the newspaper report.

Tie Expulsion to Investigation

Pontiki said the envoy had been expelled because of improper involvement in an investigation of shootings in Greece in which a Central Intelligence Agency agent and a United States serviceman were killed, and another serviceman was seriously wounded.

The official list of foreign diplomats in Athens, published by the Foreign Ministry, lists no United States Embassy official named Huey.

In December 1975 gunmen shot and killed Richard Welch, the C.I.A. station chief in Athens. Last November

George Tsantes, a United States Navy Captain and member of the Joint United States Military Assistance Group, was shot and killed.

Last month Master Sgt. Robert Judd of the United States Army, was shot and wounded.

No One Charged in Shootings

Responsibility for all three shootings was claimed by a group calling itself 17 November, for the day in 1973 when students at the Athens Polytechnic School staged an unsuccessful uprising against the Greek military dictatorship.

Nothing further is known of the group, and no one has ever been arrested or charged in the shootings.

The newspaper said the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, John McMahon, discussed the incident with Greece's Minister for Public Order, Ioannis Skoularikis, during a recent visit to Athens.

The newspaper said the official it identified as Huey was accused of conducting a separate investigation of the shootings without cooperating with Greek authorities. It did not say when he was expelled.

[Evidence]

THE CENSOR AT WORK



This official CIA photograph was introduced at a recent Senate hearing by Deputy Director John McMahon, who testified in support of a bill (S. 1324) that would exempt the CIA's operational files from the Freedom of Information Act. McMahon explained to the Select Committee on Intelligence that the picture dramatizes a single FOIA search in which 9½ linear feet of documents were reviewed, but only a six-inch stack was finally made public. He told the committee that such searches are wasteful, since "the public derives little meaningful information from the occasional isolated paragraph which is ultimately released." By exempting these files from FOIA searches, he argued, "the public [would be] deprived of no meaningful information whatsoever." The Senate has passed the bill; it is pending before the House.

Hiding history forever

While Congress was working itself into a frenzy over the CIA's involvement in mining a Nicaraguan harbor, a bill was quietly approved by a House committee that could make it impossible for researchers, historians, reporters or average citizens to demand access to some CIA working files.

The bill would exempt the CIA's so-called operational files from the Freedom of Information Act, much of them forever. The bill is a fright.

It isn't clear what is meant by "operational files," or what's to stop the CIA from merely shifting embarrassing or damaging information from other files into this new sanctuary. The files would be sealed forever, destroying important parts of the record of U.S. intelligence activities.

The CIA says the exemption is needed to relieve its staff of the enormous burden imposed by the hundreds of Freedom of Information Act requests that require thousands of hours of staff time to go over every word to prevent exposure of sources and methods.

The result, Deputy CIA Director John McMahon told the Senate Intelligence Committee, is that it takes two to three years for a request to be acted upon, and then the applicant may end up with a few fragments surrounded by blacked-out lines.

"Yet we never cease to worry about these fragments," McMa-

hon told the senators. "Perhaps we missed the source-revealing significance of some item. . . . Those who have trusted us may lose their reputation, their livelihood, or their lives. . . ."

News groups, the American Civil Liberties Union and historians favor action that would allow the CIA to speed up information-act requests, but they are nervous about the legislation, nonetheless. Government operational files, said George Washington University historian Anna Nelson, "usually go far beyond sources and methods. Traditionally they include the policy guidelines and the planning process of such operational activities. They are, in fact, the heart of governmental decision-making."

Nelson said file cabinets marked "operational" would likely become repositories for documents that might merely be embarrassing. Historians are particularly concerned that the files could be sealed forever. "We differ from many other nations," Nelson testified, "in that we have always been able to face up to all facets of our past."

Open-government advocates do not believe an effective Freedom of Information Act will endanger CIA operatives, investigations or the nation's security. And we don't trust the CIA, or any other government agency, to arbitrarily decide what it will keep in the drawer marked "secret/forever."

EAST-WEST TRADE Benefit or Trap?

By William J. Gill

For decades, the US has traded technology and food to the USSR, in return for little else than spies, aggression and dirty tricks. Here's an in-depth examination of this continuing situation.

Each day for the past 20 years, millions of dollars in American-grown grain, American-made products and American-invented technology have poured out of American ports into the vast, insatiable maw of the Soviet Union.

In return, with the exception of a few products such as vodka and caviar, the US has received from the USSR an unending supply of spies, open or ill-concealed aggression in Asia, Africa and Central America and healthy doses of disinformation designed to hasten the demise of our country and Western civilization.

This dangerously uneven exchange is euphemistically called East-West trade. Such trade between the US and its allies with the Soviet bloc has grown to billions of dollars annually, most of it fueled by long-term credits at low interest rates gratuitously provided by Western bankers.

Dr. Zdzislaw M. Rurarz, Poland's ambassador to Japan until the Jaruzelski junta declared martial law in December 1981, has testified before a congressional committee that the Soviet Union and its subject countries never had any intention of paying off the huge trade debt, estimated now to be between \$80 and \$100 billion.

In fact, Rurarz said, by virtue of this staggering debt the USSR now holds the economies of the West hostage. "I spent most of my career in the international trade arena," Rurarz said, "and I know how absolutely necessary trade with the West is to

the Communist bloc. Without it, they could not sustain their economies and they certainly could not continue to support the Soviet armaments buildup that now threatens the entire world."

John N. McMahon, deputy director of the CIA, recently said that during the past 10 years—the same decade of accelerated East-West trade—the number of countries controlled by the USSR or under Soviet spheres of influence has doubled, from 25 in 1973 to 50 today.

McMahon said the domino theory has been proved and the Soviets are reaching worldwide to control the choke points of international trade, while stepping up their efforts to steal or otherwise acquire the most advanced Western technology. "There are 30 companies in the US owned by the Soviets or the Soviet bloc," McMahon said. Obviously, their mission is to expedite the export of American technology to the USSR.

"An element of the SS-18 (the Soviet "super missile") is based on a US design, as is the range-finder in the new Soviet tank," McMahon told the recent convention of the Reserve Officers Association of the US. He also said that the Soviets had the plans for our C-5A aircraft before it even flew.

The CIA revelations add new substance to the disclosures made in THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE's October 1981 issue, by journalist M. Stanton Evans. In his article, Evans itemized some of the materiel the US has shipped to the USSR, including laser technology, high-speed computers, semiconductors, jet-engine technology, advanced radar systems, inertial guidance technology and precision ball bearing

technology. Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the imposition of martial law in Poland, the US again is increasing its trade with the USSR. The Soviet Union, from Lenin to Andropov, has played the US and the other industrial free-world nations as a conductor directs a symphony orchestra, using trade as the baton to entice the musicians into playing the Communist tune.

Indeed, every time the Soviet economy has been on the verge of total collapse, the West has rushed to its rescue. In 1921, when famine struck Russia in the wake of the Bolshevik holocaust, Herbert Hoover organized the American relief expeditions that sent tons of food to the infant USSR.

Although Hoover and America acted out of humanitarian motives, the food shored up the shaky Soviet regime and probably kept it from being overthrown by counter-revolutionary forces still active inside Russia at that time. Curiously, Herbert Hoover was also the prime mover in industrializing the Soviet Union in the mid-1920s and early '30s. As secretary of commerce and, later, as President, he prompted the sale of heavy industrial plants to the USSR, including automotive and truck factories that are believed still to turn out tanks and other military vehicles.

In 1933, the sagging Soviet economy got another lift when President Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the USSR diplomatically and signed a trade pact with the Kremlin. WWII, of course, saw American aid flow in huge quantities to the Soviet Union. At war's end, Stalin showed his gratitude by clamping a stranglehold on Eastern Europe, supporting Mao in the takeover of China and stepping up subversion worldwide.

For a period during the 1950s, US trade with the Soviets slowed. But after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the West's trade gates to the East opened wide and, with a few temporary exceptions, have remained open ever since. Incongruously, some of the biggest boosts in US exports to the USSR, including the first large grain shipments, came during the Vietnam War.

President Jimmy Carter reduced grain shipments to the Soviets and imposed other trade sanctions after Afghanistan, but the Reagan administration has approved a new long-term grain agreement and our allies openly defy our sanctions.

NEW YORK POST

17 April 1984

STAT

STAT

Moynihan's resignation smacks of grandstanding

FEW SUPPORTERS

Sen. Moynihan protests too much. He is an old hand in the grey goings on of intelligence and has been a prominent member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence since he was first elected to the Senate in 1976.

As vice chairman of the committee since 1981, and very often as acting chairman in Sen. Goldwater's many absences, he has always known when a guarded statement by CIA officials needed to be probed by further confidential questioning.

HOST OF QUESTIONS

His highly publicized resignation as committee vice chairman — filmed in his office last Friday but broadcast by ABC-TV "This Week" only on Sunday — raises a number of questions.

Why did Moynihan keep CIA director William J. Casey and deputy director Jack McMahon waiting in an antechamber while he made his resignation statement to the ABC-TV cameras?

Further, when he then received Casey and McMahon to review the briefings, why did he not tell them that he had just made his statement resigning as the committee's vice chairman?

If Moynihan's resignation was fit to be given to a TV camera crew would it not have been common decency, to say nothing of politeness, to have informed Casey at the same time?

Why did his New York constituents have to wait two days, courtesy of a TV program, to learn of their Senator's resignation when he could have made it known last Friday?

If Moynihan is as offended as he makes out, why did he not resign immediately when he felt he had been inadequately informed by the CIA?

Moynihan says he was briefed on the mining operation by his senior committee aide just before he voted, on April 6 to approve continuing U.S. support for the Nicaraguan democratic forces, including the mining operations.

Why didn't he resign then? Further, having waited a week to resign the vice chairmanship why didn't he go all the way and resign from the full committee?

Moynihan's sense of outrage about the CIA's briefings is not shared by Rep. Edward Boland (D-Mass.), chairman of the House intelligence committee and an opponent of the mining.

Presumably the House committee gets the same basic CIA briefings as the Senate committee. Yet Boland told the House last Thursday that his committee had been given the most exact details of the mining operation by Casey and that his committee had closely monitored the activity from its start last January.

Boland's committee even recalled Casey to keep itself up with the operation. Thus, on March 27, Casey provided details not only of the ports seeded with the non-lethal "acoustic" mines but the names of ships hit together with their nationalities and cargoes.

~~"There has been some complaint~~

about some other body (the Senate committee) not keeping pace with what was happening," he said. "I know what my responsibilities are and members of our committee knew what their responsibility was to the membership of this House."

AND FURTHERMORE

Nor is Moynihan's righteous indignation shared unanimously by members of his own committee.

Sen. Bentsen (D-Tex.) says there was precise reference to the mining operation in the CIA briefings. Senators Durenberger (R-Minn.), Chafee (R-R.I.), Cohen (R-Me.) and Biden (D-Del.) do not feel the briefings were adequate.

On the other hand, Sen. Garn (R-Utah) is completely satisfied and says: "We were informed twice in March. There are ways and means, if a Senator or Congressman is not lazy, to become informed."

Sen. Lugar (R-Ind.), who voted against the mining, says: "Any Senator, whether he is on the Senate intelligence committee or not, can be as well informed as he wants to be. Any Senator can go to the Senate intelligence committee and read as much as he wishes to read from the classified transcript."

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-1

WASHINGTON POST
16 April 1984

STAT

Covert Aid Salvage Try Under Way

By Charles R. Babcock
and Bob Woodward
Washington Post Staff Writers

The Reagan administration is trying to salvage faltering congressional and public support for its secret war against Nicaragua by attempting to focus new attention on the size of the Soviet and Cuban military buildup in Central America and playing down the controversy over U.S.-directed mining of Nicaraguan harbors.

In an effort to rescue \$21 million in funding for the covert operations, CIA Director William J. Casey told the Senate last week that the controversial CIA-directed mining of Nicaraguan harbors was not an integral part of the program. President Reagan and intelligence officials also began giving stronger emphasis to specific figures about the scope of the threat they see in the region.

CIA officials have said that their intelligence collection shows:

- The Soviet Union is spending between \$4 billion and \$4.5 billion each year in Cuba and \$250 million to \$300 million elsewhere in Central America.

- The Soviets have about 10,000 personnel in Cuba; 8,000 of these are technicians and 2,000 are military. About 100 Soviets are in Nicaragua.

- The Cubans have between 7,000 and 10,000 personnel in Nicaragua, of whom between 2,500 and 3,500 are military. Casey has said that the Cuban military personnel in Nicaragua have shaved their Castro-style beards, discarded their

Cuban uniforms and been integrated into many units of the regular Sandinista army.

The president cited similar, but slightly lower, figures on the Soviet-Cuban presence in Nicaragua in a radio address Saturday in which he said, "We cannot turn our backs on this crisis at our doorstep."

Others in and out of the administration are skeptical of the CIA figures. One congressional source familiar with the intelligence estimates said yesterday, "My fear is that in the effort to save the program they will overstate their case and undermine the truth, which is that there has been a very substantial buildup" by Soviets and Cubans.

This source noted that the Soviets have sent new generations of air defense missiles, planes and maritime equipment to Cuba.

Sen. David F. Durenberger (R-Minn.), a member of the Senate intelligence committee who has supported the administration's requests for covert funding, said yesterday that he questioned the Soviet-Cuban troop numbers being used by administration officials.

"The Sandinistas are supposed to be moving Cubans out," he said. "There are probably substantially fewer there than there were six months ago."

Durenberger also criticized the administration for making no real attempt "to sell" Congress or the public on the Kissinger commission's recommendations to fund long-term economic growth in the region.

"The really frustrating thing is the president has got to lift this out of mining and covert operations, and lift it into the larger context and get it out to the American people," he said.

Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), an intelligence committee member who voted against the \$21 million in covert aid, said yesterday that the administration has been trying "to substitute a covert operation for a foreign policy." He said on ABC-TV's "This Week With David Brinkley" that "there is no real military solution short of sending in U.S. troops."

Administration officials made themselves available to reporters over the weekend as part of the new public relations offensive; and former secretary of state Henry A. Kissinger and U.N. Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, also appearing on ABC, urged the president to be more forceful in telling the public about the importance of U.S. interests in Central America.

Kissinger criticized Reagan for letting the debate "degenerate into \$50 million increments" and added that, "at the present level of effort, pro-

duced in large part by our domestic division, [the policy] is a recipe for disaster."

Kirkpatrick echoed the need for more aid to head off what might become a "really major threat" to U.S. national security. She said the biggest threat was not combat troops on U.S. borders.

"It is in fact nuclear missiles, it's chemical weapons, which are another really important threat looming on the horizon," Kirkpatrick said. She said she did not have evidence that the Soviets planned to use chemical weapons in Central America but said there had been no warning that they would use them in Southeast Asia, as the administration has alleged.

Casey told U.S. News & World Report in an interview published today, "I think that people in the long run are less concerned about reports of mining Nicaraguan harbors than they are about the danger of creating a wave of immigration into this country if Central America or any part of it fall under Soviet-Cuban domination."

Last week's mining controversy clearly damaged the administration's support in Congress for the covert war, however. Sources said, for instance, that Casey acknowledged to a group of senators last Tuesday that the mining was not an integral part of the U.S. effort in opposing Nicaragua. This distressed some intelligence committee members who had voted the week before to approve \$21 million in additional funding for covert operations in Central America without realizing the extent of the U.S. role in the mining.